



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10/10
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,416	04/21/2004	Bernard R. Neustadt	CN06055US01	9100
24265	7590	09/20/2004	EXAMINER	
SCHERING-PLOUGH CORPORATION PATENT DEPARTMENT (K-6-1, 1990) 2000 GALLOPING HILL ROAD KENILWORTH, NJ 07033-0530				RAO, DEEPAK R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				1624

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/829,416	NEUSTADT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Deepak Rao	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 /are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-17 and 21-23 /are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18-20 /are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 061404.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the treatment of Parkinson's Disease, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of all other diseases of the instant claims. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that "undue experimentation" would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

Claims 18-20 are drawn to 'a method of treating central nervous system diseases or stroke' which diseases include neurodegenerative diseases. The specification discloses that the

compounds are useful as adenosine A_{2a} receptor antagonists and therefore, useful in the treatment of neurodegenerative diseases, stroke, etc., see specification, pages 1-2. The diseases listed in the specification are not known to share a common mechanism or pathway and applicants have not provided any disclosure to direct one of ordinary skill in the art that all the stated diseases are related by a common receptor activity. For example, there is no common mechanism by which all 'neurodegenerative diseases' arise. The specification discloses that the compounds possess adenosine A_{2a} receptor activity (see the test data in pages 98-101) and therefore, can be used in the treatment of CNS diseases. It is known in the art that Adenosine A_{2a} receptors abundant in central nervous system, however, the therapeutic potential of the receptor antagonists has not been elucidated, particularly with respect to the treatment of all types of diseases of the central nervous system, stroke, etc. which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. See Ongini et al. (PubMed Abstract enclosed) "While the mechanisms underlying the role of A2A receptors in the hypoxia/ ischemia processes **remains to be clarified**, it is recognized that A2A receptor antagonists counteract the effects of excitatory aminoacids, which are massively released after cerebral ischemia. Another function of A2A receptors is related to protection from seizures, **but further studies are needed** to elucidate their specific interaction, if any, with neuronal excitability." Also, state of the art provides that "There seems to be a lot of controversy about the role of adenosine in stroke" (see <http://www.anaesthetist.com/icu/manage/drugs/adenosine/>)

Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for

assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group. Also see MPEP§ 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly structure specific area. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the laundry list of diseases recited in the claims having diverse mechanisms.

Further, ‘neurodegenerative diseases’ cover diverse disorders such as Alzheimer’s disease, dementia, hereditary cerebellar ataxias, paraplegias, syringomyelia, phakomatoses, and much more. In fact, Layzer, *Cecil Textbook of Medicine* (article enclosed), states that “some degenerative diseases are difficult to classify because they involve multiple anatomic locations” (see page 2050). For example, Alzheimer’s disease has traditionally been very difficult or impossible to prevent or even to treat effectively with chemotherapeutic agents. See e.g., the Cecil Textbook of Medicine, 20th edition (1996), Vol. 2, wherein it is stated that “[t]here is no cure for Alzheimer’s disease, and no drug tried so far can alter the progress of the disease.” (pg. 1994).

There is no evidence of record, which would enable the skilled artisan in the identification of the people who have the potential of becoming afflicted with the disease(s) or disorder(s) claimed herein and therefore, require the treatment. Next, applicant’s attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that ‘a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility’. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the

instantly claimed 'method of treating' solely based on the receptor activity disclosed for the compounds.

(Only a few of the claimed diseases are discussed here to make the point of an insufficient disclosure, it does not definitely mean that the other diseases meet the enablement requirements).

In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed methods.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-17 and 21-23 are allowed. The closest reference of record, WO 01/92264 does not teach or fairly suggest the instantly claimed compounds.

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 14, 2004 and a copy is enclosed herewith.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Mukund Shah, can be reached on (571) 262-0674. If you are unable to reach Dr. Shah within a 24 hour period, please contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of 1624 at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Deepak Rao
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

September 16, 2004